REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending. Claims 12 and 20 have been amended in accordance with the Patent Office's suggestions. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Drawings

The Patent Office contends that Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as - - Prior Art - - because only that which is old is illustrated.

Applicant has disclosed that Figures 1 and 2 illustrates aspects of Applicant's invention (e.g., page 4, lines 4-7; page 7, lines 18-19). Figures 1 and 2 do not represent prior art. Applicant respectfully requests the Patent Office to remove its objection to the drawings.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Patent Office has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-19 and 24-27 for using the term "substantially the same." Applicant refers to MPEP § 2173.05:

> The term "substantially" is often used in conjunction with another term to describe a particular characteristic of the claimed invention. It is a broad term. In re Nehrenberg, 280 F.2d 161, 126 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1960). The court held that the limitation "to substantially increase the efficiency of the compound as a copper extractant" was definite in view of the general guidelines contained in the specification. In re Mattison, 509 F.2d 563, 184 USPQ 484 (CCPA 1975). The court held that the limitation "which produces substantially equal E and H plane illumination patterns" was definite because one of ordinary skill in the art would know what was meant by "substantially equal." Andrew Corp. v. Gabriel Electronics, 847 F.2d 819, 6 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant believes that the term "substantially the same" would be understand by one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant requests that the Patent Office withdraw its rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, of claims 1-19 and 24-27.

The Patent Office rejected claim 12 as indefinite for the recitation of "the other network device." Applicant has amended claim 12, line 2, to recite "sending the certificate to an other network device." Applicant believes that the amendment to claim 12 should overcome the indefiniteness rejection and requests that the Patent Office withdraw its rejection under 35 U.S.C.

§ 112, Second Paragraph, of claim 12.

The Patent Office rejected claims 20-23 as indefinite for reciting "the client based in part" on line 7 of claim 20. This portion of claim 20, line 7, has been amended to recite "a client based, in part." It is believed that amended claim 20 has sufficient antecedent basis for all terms. Applicant requests that the Patent Office withdraw its rejection of claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Mitty, U.S. Patent No. 6,145,079.

For a claim to be anticipated, each and every non-inherent claim limitation must be disclosed in a single reference. MPEP § 2131.

Claim 1 recites

> A method for authenticating a client over a network, comprising: generating a first certificate; sending the first certificate to a server, wherein the server is configured to store the first certificate; requesting a second certificate if authentication over the network is requested; sending the second certificate to the server over the network; comparing the second certificate to the first certificate at the server, and if the second certificate and the first certificate are substantially the same, authenticating the client.

Claim 7 recites

> A method for authenticating a client over a network, comprising: receiving a certificate from the client over a trusted mechanism; storing the certificate at a server; requesting another certificate if authentication is requested; comparing the other certificate to the stored certificate, and if the other certificate and the stored certificate are substantially the same, authenticating the client.

Claim 12 recites

> A method for authenticating a network device over a network, comprising: generating a certificate; sending the certificate to an other network device, wherein the other network device enables storage of the certificate; resending the certificate to the other network device; and if the resent certificate and the stored certificate are substantially the same, receiving authentication.

Claim 16 recites

> An apparatus for authenticating a client over a network, comprising: a first component configured to receive a first certificate and a second

7

certificate; and a second component, coupled to the first component, that is configured to perform actions including: determining if the first certificate and the second certificate are substantially the same; and if it is determined that the first certificate and the second certificate are substantially the same, authenticating the client associated with the first certificate and the second certificate.

Claim 20 recites

An apparatus for receiving authentication over a network, comprising: a first component configured to generate a certificate; a second component, coupled to the first component, configured to send the certificate to a server; and a third component, coupled to the second component, configured to resend the certificate to the server over the network, wherein resending the certificate enables the server to authenticate a client based, in part, on a comparison of the sent certificate and the resent certificate.

Claim 24 recites

A system for authenticating a client over a network, comprising: a client, configured to perform actions, comprising: generating a first certificate; sending the first certificate to a server to be stored; and sending a second certificate if authentication over the network is requested; and a server, in communication with the client, configured to perform actions, comprising: storing the first certificate at the server if the first certificate is received for a first time; comparing the second certificate to the first certificate; and authenticating the client over the network, if the first certificate and the second certificate are substantially the same.

Claim 26 recites

A system for authenticating a client over a network, comprising: a client, further comprising: means for generating a first certificate; means for sending the first certificate to a server to be stored; and means for sending a second certificate if authentication over the network is requested; and a server, in communication with the client, further comprising: means for storing the first certificate at the server if the first certificate is received for the first time; means for comparing the second certificate to the first certificate; and means for authenticating the client, if the first certificate and the second certificate are substantially the same.

The Patent Office considers all claims to be anticipated by Mitty. The disclosure of Mitty relied upon includes the abstract; the summary; figures 1A-3A and 8; col. 3, lines 9-20 et seq; col. 4, lines 25-67 et seq; col. 7, line 40, - col. 8, line 48 et seq.; col. 10, lines 30-55 et seq; and col. 14-15 et seq.

Mitty discloses certificates (col. 4, line 64, through col. 5, line 28) that may be issued by a certificate authority. Mitty discloses a message that includes a copy of a digital certificate for a sender (col. 7, line 62, through col. 8, line 4). Mitty discloses the sender's certificate is analyzed to determine whether it is valid (col. 10, lines 49-55).

Independent claim 1 recites a first certificate is sent to a server which stores the first certificate and, if requested and sending a second certificate that the server compares to the first certificate. Independent claims 7, 12, 16, 20, 24, and 26 recite a condition of the certificates being substantially the same or comparing the second certificate to the first certificate.

Mitty does not disclose comparing a second certificate stored by a server to a first certificate or determining if the first and second certificates are substantially the same. Mitty discloses a certificate authority's certificate is obtained and used to verify the certificate authority's signature is on the sender's certificate (col. 10, lines 49-55), similar to Applicant's Background of the Invention in which a server may verify a digital signature, etc. between the certificates.

Thus, Mitty does not anticipate claims 1-27.

Claim 2 recites "the server is further configured to generate the first certificate." Mitty does not disclose this claimed subject matter. Thus, claim 2 is not anticipated by Mitty.

Claim 5 recites "the client is further configured to generate the first certificate." Mitty does not disclose this claimed subject matter. Thus, claim 5 is not anticipated by Mitty.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Mitty, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-27 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of all of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.:   10/748,760
Art Unit: 2134

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski   _March 22, 2007_
Walter J. Malinowski   Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

_3-22-07_   _Ann Okrentowich_
Date   Name of Person Making Deposit